

February 8, 1966

Dr. Glaser  
Dean, School of Medicine

Joshua Lederberg  
Professor of Genetics

(PSI)

Full-time status contract - Colorado prototype.

I agree that it would be wise to spell out quite carefully the conditions of employment under full-time status. It seems to me that there are two options between which we might choose:

1. Full-time with respect to medical practice. The rationale for this option would be the history of distortion of the academic process in schools that have not become full time. The physician here is employed by the university with the understanding that his medical practice constitutes a significant academic function for the able conduct of which he can expect to be recognized and promoted. This option is presumably the actual intent of the Colorado document, but to make it unambiguous, professional service should be defined as that service which comes under the cognizance of the law which governs the practice of medicine. Under this option, since the physician is surrendering the expectation of earning significant additional income on what might otherwise be his "own time", the present practice of a differential salary base could continue to be justified.
2. The basic premise of the second option would be that the faculty member in a medical school is expected to devote his entire energy to academic purposes. He should therefore not be subject to any financial inducements to divert these energies. In the absence of financial inducement he can therefore be left with the completely independent exercise of his own judgment with regard to the way in which he spends his time. On this view such outside activities as industrial and government consultation, lectures abroad, and the like, as well as clinical practice, would be legitimate manifestations of the faculty member's exercise of his academic responsibilities. One advantage of this approach is that it would erase the discrepancies between clinical and preclinical departments and this should also be manifested in the salary base. To be quite meaningful, however, there should be no exceptions in principle. Fees from government agencies are just as much a source of distraction of the faculty member's time and interests as fees for professional consultation from other universities or from industry. This is not to say that these are not desirable functions. On the contrary. However, there is no reason why the faculty member should be paid twice for doing his duties. In the interest of simplifying the accounting, I would suggest that extra income up to \$500 per year be overlooked completely and that income up to \$1000 per year be excluded from the terms of the contract, but nevertheless be required to be reported.

It seems to me quite important that there be an annual statement by each faculty member with respect to his outside income; otherwise the temptation for abuse, and whether it has occurred or not, the suspicion that it might have, may end up defeating the plan. It may seem like an officious proceeding, but without a periodic reminder of such a responsibility, it is all too easy to overlook deviations, especially when the fees are not necessarily aggressively sought after by the professor.